DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 346 141 TM 018 465

AUTHOR Eberhardt, Clifford
TITLE State (SEA's) Assistance in Identifying Outstanding and Lower Performing Chapter 1 Student Achievement at the Program and Individual Level.
PUB DATE 22 Apr 92
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Compensatory Education; Disadvantaged Youth; *Educational Assessment; Elementary Secondary Education; Government Role; High Achievement; Low Achievement; *Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; Public Schools; *School Districts; Scores; Standardized Tests; State Action; *State Aid; State Government; State Programs; Test Use
IDENTIFIERS *Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; Hawkins Stafford Act 1988; *Oregon

ABSTRACT

Assistance offered by the State Department of Education to school districts in Oregon to help them identify aspects of student achievement under Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (Hawkins Stafford Amendments of 1988) is discussed. Two hundred ninety-five of the 297 Oregon public school districts have Chapter 1 programs, serving a total of approximately 45,000 students. High and low performing districts are identified through standardized test scores and annual evaluation data, a process enhanced by help from the Technical Assistance Center of the Northwest Regional Laboratory. A system that considers a number of factors identifies programs needing staff attention. Summer sessions provide training for Chapter 1 coordinators. The state defines achievement goals for the districts and receives achievement reports at group and individual levels. A new focus on student achievement will be provided with the Accelerated Learning Programs for Successful Students, a program that Oregon will implement to increase the rate of learning for Chapter 1 students. Three exhibits provide information about program functions and staff. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
CLIFFORD E. EBERHARDT
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED346141

STATE (SEA'S) ASSISTANCE IN IDENTIFYING OUTSTANDING AND LOWER PERFORMING CHAPTER 1 STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AT THE PROGRAM AND INDIVIDUAL LEVEL

PAPER TO BE PRESENTED TO AERA

SAN FRANCISCO, CA

APRIL 22,1992

Clifford Eberhardt
4585 Graber NE
Salem, Oregon 97305

503 393-9139

TM018465

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

State (SEA's) Assistance in Identifying Outstanding and Lower Performing Chapter 1 Student Achievement at the Program and Individual Level

I.ORGANIZATIONAL BACKGROUND

A. Oregon State Department of Education The Oregon Department of Education is supervised by an elected superintendent. The incumbent is Norma Paulus. The chief policy making group for the state at the elementary and secondary level is an appointed board of seven members. That board also has policy responsibility for the Oregon Community College system.

1.Table of Organization The organizational structure of the Department is shown in exhibit 1.

2.Compensatory Education Division The Chapter 1 program is part of the Student Services Division, Compensatory Education Section. All state administrative funds, slightly more than five hundred thousand dollars, are used within the Chapter 1 program or go to provide support services for the activities of the program staff which include migrant education activities and services to local and state facilities for neglected and delinquent students.

a.Chapter 1 Program Staff: The Chapter 1 staff currently consists of two point five (2.5) full time equivalent staff with teaching and administrative backgrounds. Their work is supported by two (2.0) full time equivalent support staff. The Chapter 1 migrant program is part of the same group and consists of one (1.0) full time equivalent staff with teaching and administrative background and one (1.0) full time equivalent support staff.

B.Oregon School Districts There are two hundred and ninety seven public school districts in Oregon. Slightly more than one half are districts serving children kindergarten through grade twelve. Twenty one of the districts serve only secondary level students and the remaining districts serve children only at the elementary level.

1.Regional Education Service Districts (ESD's): Regional educational services are provided through a system of Educational Service Districts (ESD), which have boundaries roughly coterminous with those of the thirty six Oregon counties. However, since some counties and school district boundaries are coterminous, there are only twenty nine regional units.

C.Oregon Chapter 1 Programs Two hundred ninety five of the two hundred ninety seven Oregon school districts have Chapter 1 programs. Since several districts have very small enrollments, they have combined their funds to create cooperative Chapter 1

programs that serve a number of districts using a single fiscal agent. The programs serve approximately forty five thousand students with the largest number being served at grade two. An almost equal number are being served at grade three. A total distribution of students by grade levels from Pre Kindergarten through Grade 12 is shown in Exhibit 2.

I. IDENTIFICATION OF HIGH AND LOW PERFORMING DISTRICTS AND BUILDINGS

A. Use of Standardized Tests Oregon districts have made wide use of commercially available norm referenced achievement and diagnostic tests and only recently has a statewide testing program been made available. It would appear that districts are moving away from the use of commercially prepared standardized tests at the present time and we have found no way of telling how long this trend will continue.

1. Achievement Tests The California Achievement Test has been the most popular in Oregon for a number of years. This has been followed by SRA and CTBS sharing an almost equal share of the Chapter 1 market.

2. Diagnostic tools The Gates-Maginite Reading Test was the most popular for a number of years in reading and the Key Math for mathematics. However, recently the Stanford Diagnostic tests in reading and math are becoming more prevalent. Of course the Individual Reading Inventories (IRI's) are the most popular tool used by the reading teachers. The newer edition of the Woodcock-Johnson is also becoming increasingly popular.

3. District use in instructional programs - No matter how much training we have offered to the district and Chapter 1 staff, we have been continually disappointed with the inadequate use of achievement test information by staff, even though printouts frequently include item analysis at the building and student level. The staff is always giving us the message that "we have more important things to do than look at test results".

a. We have been forced to take the position that as the local staff goes about carrying out a needs assessment for the district, they must look at the achievement test information not only as summative evaluation information but individual test items may represent one of the measures of instructional effectiveness. During our state monitoring visit we take a careful look at how that evaluation information has been used. We do not advocate that they act solely on that information, but we do require that it be considered unless there is good evidence available that the results do not reflect the achievement level of the students in the district because of some technical issue.

B. Chapter 1 Use of Evaluation

1. The original Title I Evaluation Reporting System (TIERS) in Oregon used a stratified random sampling technique for collecting data from Chapter 1 schools for a number of years on a three year cycle. Approximately four years ago we deviated from that sampling plan and went to collecting data annually from all

schools. We did that because a number of the Chapter 1 staff had been voluntarily sending in their results annually for a number of years. Their point in submitting results voluntarily was that it was more difficult for them to gear up to submitting the results once in three years than annually. They felt that the routine was a preferred model of operation.

2.We have been following model A1 for a number of years and would be remiss if we did not recognize the assistance given by the Technical Assistance Center (TAC) staff of the Northwest Regional Laboratory when they had the TAC contract for so many years. Since their offices are in Portland, Oregon, within 50 miles of our office, we benefitted from proximity to staff expertise and I feel were able to implement the Model A1 in a very effective manner. It has been and continues to be the policy of the Department Chapter 1 program that we encourage our local Chapter 1 programs to contact the Chapter 1 TAC staff members and the Rural Technical Assistance Center (RTAC) staff members directly. We perceive our function at the state level as that of facilitator, not broker.

a.The technical expertise of the evaluation staff of the Portland School District far surpasses that of the state office and we have benefitted from frequent consultations with that staff over the years. The evaluation program in that district, headed by Walt Hathaway, has recently received permission for the Chapter 1 office at the United States Department of Education to utilize their locally normed test for Chapter 1 evaluation. They have been using a similar test for a number of years, however, we were unsure whether or not the test could meet the new standards and have been very pleased that they were able to achieve that level of technical performance.

II.USE OF NCE PERFORMANCE DATA

A. History We have collected the information on the instructional design at each school for a number of years. This database includes the
subject, the test used, the hours per week of service, the instructional setting, the pupil-staff ratio, and the use of functional level testing. Each of these factors has been analyzed in a matrix design and we have been able to study the performance data on one axis and the variations in the factor listed above. For example, we have looked at gains in relationship to the number of hours per week associated with the delivery of services. We have also analyzed the gains in relationship to the instructional setting, instruction outside the classroom, instruction in the classroom, part time in and part time outside the classroom, use of computer assisted instruction. The point is, we have not just collected the information, we have spent some time, perhaps not as much as we should have, in reviewing the results of the analysis. These analyses are used as one set of information in our guidance of the local school's delivery of services.

B. Productivity Measures: One of the more interesting pieces of analysis we have carried out was looking at the gains made by the students in relationship to the training of the staff. Specifically, we had been asked for a number of years by the local school districts whether it was more cost effective to hire teachers or instructional assistants. We took two districts, after looking at a number of districts, to find a good match, both of which had good strong programs and good gains as well as being matched on a significant number of other variables. One used almost exclusively certificated personnel and one used almost exclusively non certificated personnel, and examined the gains made in grades two through twelve. We examined that gain by looking at how much it cost in the two districts to make one NCE gain. We found that in the district with non certificated personnel it cost forty nine dollars per NCE point. In the district with certificated personnel it cost fifty one dollars per NCE point. So the cost differential was not significant. However, upon reflection, we concluded that since the non certificated personnel are being paid at about one third the rate of certificated personnel and their instructional group sizes are about the same, the difference then is that it appears to take three times as much student time to make the same gains with non certificated personnel as it takes with certificated personnel. If there is value in student time, then we seem drawn to the conclusion that it is more efficient to use certificated personnel. This is an oversimplified conclusion, but it does bear some consideration at the local level.

IV. USE OF GAINS WITH OTHER FACTORS TO RANK ORDER NEED OF DISTRICTS

A. Rationale

The limited staff at the Department is forced to be creative in our use of available time given the large number of districts we serve and the rural character of Oregon which does eat up lots of working hours in travel. We have been using a system which considers a number of factors in the identification of programs in need of staff attention.

B. Constellation of Factors The primary factor is the average NCE gains for the students in grades 2 through 12 in that district. However, that factor is supplemented by the following factors.

1. Size of allocation- The larger the allocation, the more frequently the project needs to be considered for visitation.

2. Number of children served - While there is generally a direct connection between the available funds and number of children served, that is not necessarily the case. The larger the number served, again the more frequently the project needs to be considered for visitation.

3. Tenure of coordinator - We have a scale that gradually decreases in weight up to 5 years. After 5 years we feel that there is normally little reason to be worried about their knowledge of Chapter 1 programs.

4.Number of grade levels NOT SERVED - We are concerned that the program be as comprehensive as possible. While we recognize other points of view, if the district has the funds available and fails to serve students on a continuum, we feel compelled to spend tiime with that staff. We would like to see services available to meet children's needs at all levels.

5.Length of time the present instructional model has been in use - In our experience we have found that it takes three years to get a comprehensive program change up and running. It is during this three years of new program design and implementation that we want to watch the program rather carefully. It is during this time that they are open to new ideas and have the potential of making significant alterations in program design that may or may not be effective.

6.Staff tenure - Some school districts seem to be constantly changing their Chapter 1 staff for one reason or another. The shorter the staff tenure "in Chapter 1", the greater the concern for us. If the staff is all new, then we are concerned. That concern gradually diminishes until the average is three years or more.

7.Staff training - We are much more comfortable with well trained teachers being held responsible for the delivery of the instructional program. If the program is operated exclusively by instructional assistants (with or without teacher supervision), as it is in some of our districts with very small allocations of funds, then the quality of the program is of much greater concern to us.

8.NCE Gains - When the NCE gains of the district are five or greater we are not very concerned. However, as the gains go down or into the negative area, this increases our concern for the program.

9.Percentage of students exiting successfully - We hope that some of the children are able to exit at grade level and when that figure reaches 15%, we are no longer concerned. However, as the percentages diminish, our concern increases.

10.Attendance at training activities - We keep attendance data on staff participation in training activities. If we never see the staff in training activities, this heightens our level of concern.

11.At risk - When the state staff have a feeling that the program is weak, we allow this concern to be expressed in the weighting of this item.

C.Exhibit 3 is provided for your interest and shows the weights we have associated with each of these factors. This seems to work for us and allows us to utilize our time more effectively.

V. PROVIDING INSERVICE TO DISTRICTS ON EVALUATION AND OTHER TOPICS

D.<u>Summer Schools for New Coordinators</u> When the local school district selects individuals to perform the role of Chapter 1 Coordinator, by the middle of August of their first year in that

role they have had little contact with the existing Chapter 1 programs. If we can secure their attendance at a summer school for several days we can secure their adherence to the ideas found in the Chapter 1 legislation and our evaluation procedures,

We have had summer schools for a number of years. These are usually one week in length and held in a school building. The original purpose was to introduce them to the Chapter 1 program and the TIERS system. With the advent of program improvement, we have tied these three ideas together.

E.Expansion of Training Activities This coming summer, for the first time, we are including a new strand to train paraprofessionals with the hope that we will increase their instructional effectiveness, and a third strand has been added to look at coordination with the regular program for the same reason. We are also concerned that the staff use Chapter 1 evaluation processes to identify the strengths and weaknesses in their local projects.

The primary purpose of the summer school remains to acquaint new Coordinators with the Chapter 1 program, its goals, requirements and effective practices associated with instruction.

Many of these individuals have had little or no contact with Chapter 1 programs. They are former or current building principals, teachers on special assignments, or former Chapter 1 teachers assigned to an administrative task.

F.Use of TAC's The new round of services we have been provided by the TAC's have improved the delivery of services of use to the LEA's. Our position as a state staff has been that the TAC staff should deal directly with the District staff as often as possible. We meet with members of the TAC staff rather frequently and look at statewide needs for their services.

This year we have attempted, for the first time, to resist the idea of preconceived number of days of service from the TAC staff but rather looked at conditions we wish to have created and products we want to have delivered. This appears to be working quite well.

The Specialty Option TAC and the Parent TAC have both been exceptionally helpful as we have attempted to increase the quality of the content instruction and level of parental participation.

G.Use of Breakfasts to do on Site Work We have found that local Coordinators of programs want to have face to face meetings with SEA staff. Through the use of on site breakfasts for Local Program Coordinators and staff we have found that they become attached to the Chapter 1 Goals. An example of how we use these breakfast is that Coordinators have been reflecting the national trend toward diminishing the amount of time spent on the use of formalized, standardized, norm referenced tests. In these less structured situations we are able to explore locally acceptable alternatives that retain the essential characteristics of an

effective evaluation system. Though more time consuming, we find that these breakfasts are best provided during the months of late September or early October when people are just getting started, the second round is late November or early December, the third round is in the middle of February and the last round is late April or early May.

We have found that four times a year is about right. We try to have a local Coordinator call the meeting and pick the topic, which is communicated to the state staff. We then gather materials and ideas to help solve their locally identified problems.

H. Monitoring the Program Implementation in the District Oregon has followed a monitoring and enforcement plan that calls for a staff member to do an on site visit to all districts once every three years. However, we have monitored the Portland, Oregon district every year. At that time we cover one third of the buildings in the district. We also try to spend time in every school in the district served with Chapter 1 funds during those monitoring visits.

VI. PROVIDING ACHIEVEMENT GOALS FOR THE DISTRICTS

A. Direction In Oregon the average pre test NCE is 32. It has been at that level for a number of years, which is a concern of our office. We feel that if we work on both fronts simultaneously, that is prevention and acceleration (remediation), then we should be making a difference and that figure should be increasing.

B. Delivering Expectations By Grade Level Spans For a number of years building and district level administrators have requested statewide average gain information so that they might use that information as baseline information and set their local goals at that level. We have always provided them with this information.

C. Use of Minimum Gains When the 1988 revisions of the Chapter 1 law required districts and the state to identify the minimum expected gains, which could be no lower than a positive gain, this, in effect, took the pressure off Oregon Chapter 1 program staff. Prior to that time the expected level was the statewide average gain. We were very disappointed with the position taken in the law. We suggested to the Committee of Practitioners (a state level advisory committee required by the Chapter 1 Law) that we should gradually increase the expectations until they were at least five (5) at the elementary level and three (3) at the secondary level. They agreed and we were able to hold this position for about 6 months, until the teachers started to protest that this was higher than what was required by the law and was too much to expect from some of them. The Committee of practitioners backed off and lowered it to 1 NCE at all levels.

D. The Goals Being Used in Oregon Oregon has started stating the expected level of achievement on three planes. The last and

highest level is designed to bring the average Chapter 1 child to grade level within 24 months of their entering the program and sustaining them at that level. This will mean that the average statewide NCE gain at all grade levels will have to be nine (9) or better, given our average pre test NCE of 32.

1. The first, and LOWEST LEVEL ACCEPTED, is the minimum allowed by our interpretation of Federal law which is 1 NCE. We tried to use a higher level when this measure was first introduced and gradually increase the expected level over a three year period. We originally got this level accepted by the Committee of Practitioners and then had teachers come to the Committee and tell them that the expectation was too high. The Committee then reduced the expectation to 1 NCE on a trial basis, and that is where we are now.

2.The Second level is the AVERAGE STATEWIDE ACHIEVEMENT in that subject at that grade level. Rather frequently we have Superintendents and Principals calling and asking what that level is at the present time and they in turn set that as a local goal for their staff. If their staffs do not achieve that level, they institute their local version of Program Improvement.

3.The Third level is the level we need to achieve if we are to achieve our target of EXITING THE AVERAGE STUDENT, AT GRADE LEVEL, FROM THE PROGRAM WITHIN TWO SCHOOL YEARS. That level is very high and we know that at the primary grades they are now close to achieving that level.

E.Expected Achievement at the High School Level We have acknowledged that it is more difficult to get the gains as the student gets older, but we have concluded from this that the instructional design must be that much more effective.

F.Reporting Achievement by Instructional Design We have been following this for eight (8) years. Consistently we have found that the Pull Out model demonstrates the highest gain in NCE's. We have not gathered data on the instruction that was missed because of student participation and relied upon national studies to assess that impact. While we have seen a great deal of interest in the literature regarding the achievement of the students in basic skills, what we have not seen is the impact that the pull out model has on student achievement in science, social studies, or other subjects the students have missed when receiving their supplemental instruction in the basic skill.

We have also found that the lowest gains have been made through the use of computer assisted instruction (CAI) although that model continues to increase in popularity. We have attempted to provide guidance in that area and encouraged Chapter 1 staff to visit sites where the proposed software has been used successfully. We are still having difficulty with staff showing greater interest in the equipment than the software.

VII.STUDENT LEVEL ACHIEVEMENT

We have found that past reviews, that is reviews carried out prior to the implementation of the 1988 law, of student performance were very subjective and student performance of the "Chapter 1 Lifers" was seldom analyzed. At the state level we were not providing adequate leadership to carry out this goal. We believe one of the best revisions made to the law in 1988 was the requirement for review of individual student performance. At the present time individual student performance is being assessed by individuals or teams, and they are in turn seeking to alter individual programs that are not effective or they are even considering other alternative programs besides Chapter 1 which may provide services more in line with the student's needs. WE believe that the next step is a revision in the TIERS model which requires buildings to report the numbers of students they find that have not made a positive gain in the last two (2) years.

A.Individual Record Cards for up to 4 Years We designed a card that had all of the information requirements on it to comply with TIERS and made it available to school districts. It is a card that can be sent with the student when they change schools because it contains no information covered in the family privacy act. That card, a computer program, or some other methodology is being used to accrue the student level information. Prior to the new position on individual achievement few people were tracking student progress over time. We designed the precursor to this current card more than 10 years ago, but only a small handful of districts were interested enough to keep or examine that individual information.

1.We now find schools providing opportunities for pre and post scores to be analyzed. We now find that teams, including the Chapter 1 staff, the classroom teacher, and less frequently the parents, are being brought together when student performance is not in the positive range and other indicators confirm the concern of the staff that the student is not making the expected achievement gains. These teams are being effectively used to make programmatic revisions. We would be less than truthful if we said that this was the situation statewide, but we believe at least 60% of the children are being provided this level of analysis.

B.Group Pre and Post Test Results Examination Were The Norm, Now Individual Results Have Been Added How do we ask Chapter 1 teachers and the classroom staff to carry out this task at the individual student level? First of all, we have to give them time. Time to look at the results, think about their experiences with the student, seek advice from others and take responsibility for that lack of achievement. We have been quick to accept the accolades for our successes, however we are not quite so quick to accept the responsibility for our lack of success, or perhaps they should be called our challenges.

1.Item Analysis - Too frequently Oregon Chapter 1 staff are using the group test scores with greater emphasis than we believe was ever intended, especially considering the size of our

programs and the small numbers of students taking both the pre and post tests in most schools. We have tried to create an interest in looking at the items on the achievement test to ascertain the significance of the question for Chapter 1 children. While most of our district staff do not have the skill or funds to create curriculum based assessment models, they can certainly look at the results of item analysis that many of them receive from their scoring services.

2.Longitudinal Studies - We need to keep track of exited students and check long term impact. We have been very concerned that while there is reason to be proud of the numbers of students exited from our program at grade level, we have not had a long term process for monitoring their needs. Once out of the program they are too frequently forgotten. They should not be and we have been encouraging staff to spend a portion of their time following up former Chapter 1 students that they may have had five or eight years ago and see how they are doing. We have this feeling that far too many of our students are not doing well in high school. We are very concerned that far too many of them appear to be guided into less demanding electives at the 11th and 12th grades. We believe we have some very disturbing information which indicates that our teachers have diminished expectations for present and former Chapter 1 students in Oregon.

VIII. A NEW WAY OF LOOKING AT STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

A. <u>The Future</u> Recently we had an opportunity to review our Mission Statement as a Chapter 1 staff. We have had input from the field as well as the TAC's in that effort. We decided that our program focus will be Accelerated Learning Programs for Successful Students (ALPSS). We have come to believe that the problem facing the students we are serving is that they are learning the academic outcomes we have set for them at too slow a pace. We believe that we need to create an acceleration in the rate of learning for the Chapter 1 students. The end product is that the student will arrive at their destination (ie: grade level or above) in a shorter period of time. Accelerating the rate of learning seems to make more sense to the child and parent, as well as the teacher. It does not label the child, but rather allows them to participate in a program that has a particular function. That function could support any student at any functional level.

B. <u>Evaluating Student Progress in the New Model</u> We need to measure the pace at which a student is learning. Our goal needs to be to increase that pace. We believe that we can still utilize NCE's, or we can use other measures as well, as long as we view that measure as an indicator of "rate of learning". We hope to view each student not only as an individual within a group by position within the group but also as an individual with a measured rate of learning within a group with different learning rates. The teacher now has two tasks, to improve the student's standing within the norm group but also positively impact the rate of learning.

1. Chapter 1 teachers, as part of district staff efforts, are examining the use of portfolio assessment activities in Oregon. This use of portfolio assessment to augment test data is not new and has been carried out by teachers, especially at the primary level, for a number of years. However, what is new is the standardization of measures being brought to the portfolio process so that the district and state staff members might increase the inter rater reliability.

IX. LEVEL OF EXITING

Several years ago our State Board of Education asked that we collect and analyze the percentage of students exiting the Chapter 1 program at grade level as reported by the district. We are looking at the district level data rather than the building level data and we are doing that from three perspectives.

A. Exiting Percentages It has held rather consistently, statewide, that we have been able to exit, at grade level, fourteen (14%) percent of the students enrolled in the program. We have set a state goal of twenty five (25%) in our rather informal communications with the District Chapter 1 Coordinators.

B. New Percentages We have also been collecting data on the number of children that are new to the program each year. What this has revealed to us is that some districts are operating on the philosophy that they will concentrate the program at a single grade level or narrow grade span, giving help to those students. They are bringing very few up to grade level (unless they are using Reading Recovery or Success in Reading) and thus Chapter 1 becomes not a program, but an extra spurt of effort. We certainly ask them to look at the program design and consider redirecting their efforts toward long term effects.

C. Carry Over Percentages We also collect the number of students carried over from one year to the next. What this data shows us is that if the program has very low percentages of students exiting the program and lots of carry over, we have a program of questionable effectiveness.

X. CONCLUSION

While the preceding information would appear to cause the reader to reach the conclusion that Oregon's Chapter 1 program is heavily into data analysis, we want everyone to know that it is our goal to improve the quality of the interaction between staff paid with Chapter 1 funds, the regular classroom teacher, the parents and the individual student .

A. On Site Visitations to Effective Programs Several years ago we asked an individual working on her doctorate in reading, a person with a number of years of teaching experience and experience

in Chapter 1 programs as well, to visit 11 programs that had outstanding NCE gains for three consecutive years and well outside the error boundaries, in reading. We asked her to collect information in a structured manner and report her conclusions to us. She found that these teachers were highly variable in the programs they used. They were using everything from very direct, skills based instruction to whole language reading strategies. Her conclusion was that all of the teachers were highly skilled in their interpersonal relationships, very energetic, and enthusiastic about what they were doing. Our conclusion has been that it is not the program, but generally it is the enthusiasm and skill the individual teacher brings to the program. This causes us to encourage our teachers to follow these guidelines.

1.Take good care of yourself. Get adequate rest and eat well. Stay in shape. This job takes a great deal of energy.

2.Maintain enthusiasm for the job. If you feel that what you are doing is not effective, look at alternatives. But do whatever you must to maintain the enthusiasm.

3.Have a good grasp of the needs of the individual student and plan programs to meet those needs. NCE gains will take care of themselves. Individual student gains will also take care of themselves.

B.Advice to Others I have come to believe that these three axioms apply not only to Chapter 1 staff, but to classroom teachers and parents as well. It is the individual working with the student that makes the big difference. The individual uses available tools, but the individual human problem solving ability is what makes the program effective.

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

State Superintendent of Public Instruction (Norma Paulus)
Deputy Superintendent for Education Programs (Bob Burns)

Executive Assistant (Sharon Toland)
Executive Support Specialist to Superintendent (Karen Hendricks)
Executive Assistant for Research and Planning (Marilyn Lane)
Executive Support Specialist to Deputy (Rosalie Smith)

State Board of Education

Associate Superintendent to State Board (Joyce Benjamin)
Executive Support Specialist to State Board (Carol Morgan)

Deputy Superintendent Management Services
(Rick Burke)

- School Finance & Data Info
- Business/Facilities
- Office Automation
- Clerical Support
- Personnel Services
- Internal Auditing
- Chapter 2 Administration

Deputy Superintendent Government Relations
(Greg McMurdo)

- State and Federal Legislation
- OAR Management
- Public Information and Media Relations
- Legal Services
- Fair Dismissal Appeals Board
- Publications
- Local School District and ESD Support Services
  - Business Services
  - Pupil Transportation

Early Childhood Council

Asst. Supt. — Miller

Coordination of Programs:

- Head Start
- Early Intervention
- Child Development Specialists
- Child Nutrition
- Migrant Education
- Pregnant and Parenting Teens
- Bilingual Education

Office of Curriculum/Instruction and Evaluation

Assoc. Supt. — Neuburger
Asst. Supt. — Hutton

- Statewide Assessment/ Evaluation
- Standards Elementary and Secondary
- Private School Standards and Registration
- Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges
- Curriculum (K-12)
- Instructional Technology
- Instructional Materials Services
- School Nutrition

Office of Professional Technical Education

Assoc. Supt. — Hoye

- Curriculum Development Professional Tech.
- Workforce/Job Training
- Private Vocational Schools Licensing
- Veterans Programs Administration
- Career Education
- Student Leadership Center (contract)
- Teen Parent Program

Office of Special Education

Assoc. Supt. — Brazeau

- State-Operated Schools and Programs
- Special Education Administration
- Comprehensive System of Personnel Development
- Home School Program
- Talented and Gifted
- Early Intervention

Office of Student Services

Assoc. Supt. — Fuller
Asst. Supt. — Miller

- Compensatory Education (7 federal programs)
- Drug & Alcohol (federal grants administration)
- Guidance and Counseling
- Alternative Education
- Child Development Specialists
- Student Retention
- Student Activities
- Head Start (Oregon prekindergarten)

21st Century Schools Council

Asst. Supt. — Reinke

Coordination of School Reform:

- Staff Development
- Management of 21st Century Schools Act
- School Improvement
- School Recognition Program
- Beginning Teacher Support Program

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Exhibit 2

ENROLLMENT IN CHAPTER 1 PROGRAMS IN OREGON
1990-1991 SCHOOL YEAR

Grade	Number of Students
Pre K	53
Kindergarten	1431
One	6465
Two	7908*
Three	6254
Four	5125
Five	4280
Six	3178
Seven	2855
Eight	2322
Nine	2317
Ten	1143
Eleven	754
Twelve	608
Total	44,693

Exhibit 3

CHAPTER 1 DISTRICT RATING SYSTEM

Characteristic	Maximum Points
Size of Allocation	25
Number of Children Served	10
Tenure of Coordinator	20
Number of Grade Levels Not Served	12
Length of Time Present Model in Use	20
Staff Tenure	8
Staff Training	8
NCE Gains	10
Percentages of Students Exiting Successfully	15
Attendance at Staff Training Sessions	5
At Risk Program (state staff designation)	20
Total Possible	153

COMMENTARY

The points associated with each component of the rating system will be totaled. The district totals will be rank ordered and grouped in a manner that reflects the frequency distribution of the sums.

If a District has a high total, that district will be visited more frequently and be targeted for closer scrutiny at the time of monitoring and application review. That sum will reflect a relative amount of time that needs to be spent with the District.

CHARACTERISTIC		POINTS
SIZE OF ALLOCATION		
0	5000	5
5000		
10000	10	
10000	25000	15
25000	100000	20
100000		25
NUMBER OF CHILDREN SERVED		
0	20	1
20	50	2
50	100	3
100	500	5
500	1000	8
1000		10

TENURE OF COORDINATOR

0	20
1	15
2	10
3-5	5
5	0

NUMBER OF GRADE LEVELS NOT SERVED

0	0
12	12

LENGTH OF TIME PRESENT SERVICE MODEL IN USE

1s Year	20
2d Year	15
3rd Year	10
4h Year	0

STAFF TENURE

Average 1 Years	8
Average 2 Years	6
Average 3 Years	4
Average 4 Years	0

STAFF TRAINING

All Aides	8
Aides and Non Norm Teachers	6
Non Normed Teachers	4
Normed Teachers	0

NCE GAINS

-0 CE	10
2 CE	8
3 CE	6
4 CE	4
5 CE	0

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS EXITING SUCCESSFULLY

0-5%	15
5-10%	10
10-15%	5
15-%	0

ATTENDANCE AT TRAINING SESSIONS

Never	5
Some	3
Frequent	0

AT RISK PROGRAM

At Risk	20
Not at Risk	0